

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH,

PLAINTIFF

v.

Washava Moye,

DEFENDANT

Case No. 3:22-cv-02018-TLW

Order

Plaintiff Marie Assa'ad-Faltas, MD, MPH, proceeding pro se, filed this civil action on June 24, 2022, against Washava Moye. ECF No. 1. The matter now comes before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) filed by the magistrate judge to whom this case was assigned. ECF No. 12. Specifically, the magistrate judge's report addresses Plaintiff's motion for a temporary restraining order, ECF No. 4.

As noted by both the magistrate judge and the South Carolina Supreme Court, Plaintiff "is a prolific frivolous filer." ECF No. 12 at 8. In this instance, Plaintiff seeks relief from the South Carolina Supreme Court's June 10, 2022 Order finding Plaintiff in contempt and sentencing her to six months in prison, suspended upon the service of 10 days. *Id.* at 2. Plaintiff filed the instant motion on Friday, June 24, 2022, seeking injunctive relief from the South Carolina Supreme Court's Order directing her to report on Monday, June 27, 2022, to serve her 10 day sentence. *Id.* In the Report, the magistrate judge recommends that Plaintiff's motion for a temporary restraining order be denied. Plaintiff did not file objections to the Report. This matter is now ripe

for decision.

The Court is charged with conducting a *de novo* review of any portion of the Report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that Report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. In the absence of objections to the Report, the Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 200 (4th Cir. 1983). In such a case, “a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

The Court has carefully reviewed the Report. For the reasons stated by the magistrate judge, the Report, ECF No. 12, is **ACCEPTED**. Plaintiff’s motion for a temporary restraining order, ECF No. 4, is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Terry L. Wooten
Terry L. Wooten
Senior United States District Judge

November 7, 2022
Columbia, South Carolina